

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JESUS TORRES RAYGOZA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B208891

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. LA058052)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Rick Brown and Burt Pines, Judges. Affirmed.

Katharine Eileen Greenebaum, under appointment by the Court of Appeal,
for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Jesus Torres Raygoza appeals from the judgment entered following his no contest plea to possession of a controlled substance (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)).¹ Appellant entered into an *Arbuckle*² waiver of the right to be sentenced by the same judge who accepted his plea and, pursuant to his negotiated plea, was sentenced to prison for 16 months.

According to the probation report, on February 7, 2008, officers were conducting random checks for criminal activity at various motels throughout the San Fernando Valley. After observing appellant's name on the motel's registration list and checking appellant's photocopied California identification card, the officers determined appellant had an outstanding felony warrant. When the officers observed appellant walking through the parking lot of the motel, they arrested him. Upon searching appellant, the officers recovered a small plastic baggie containing methamphetamine and a glass pipe.

After review of the record, appellant's court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief requesting this court to independently review the record pursuant to the holding of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.

On December 4, 2008, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider and no response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that no arguable issues exist and that appellant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113.)

¹ Appellant also pled no contest in case number PA054035 to driving while having a blood alcohol of .08 percent or higher (Veh. Code, § 23152, subd. (b)) with the understanding that his prison sentence of two years would be concurrent to his sentence in the instant case. The instant appeal does not involve case number PA054035.

² *People v. Arbuckle* (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 749.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

MANELLA, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

SUZUKAWA, J.